

### REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 15, 2009, and the Advisory Action dated September 30, 2009. Claims 2-4, 6-18, 39, and 40 are presented for examination, of which Claim 39 is in independent form. Claims 4, 6, 13, 15-17, 39, and 40 have been amended to define aspects of Applicants' invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 2-18, 39, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants have carefully reviewed and amended Claim 39 as deemed necessary to ensure that it conforms fully to the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph, with special attention to the points raised in section 3 of the Office Action and section 2 of the Advisory Action. It is believed that the rejections under Section 112, second paragraph, have been obviated, and their withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 2-18 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,070,142 (*McDonough*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,014,645 (*Cunningham*) and further in view of U.S. Patent Appln. Pub. No. 2001/0044840 (*Carleton*); and Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *McDonough* in view of *Cunningham* and *Carleton*. For at least the reasons presented below, Applicants submit that independent Claim 39, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited references.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication, at page 3 of the Advisory Action, that if Claim 39 were amended to read that the client actually “adds” the worker utility in the context of the system claim, then the cited rejection, as applied, of *McDonough* and *Cunningham* would fail to teach this limitation. Claim 39 has been so amended. Accordingly,

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 39 is in condition for allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The other rejected claims in the present application depend from Claim 39, and therefore are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 50-3939.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan Berschadsky/  
Jonathan Berschadsky  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 46,551

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
1290 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10104-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200